

**FA1-00610-1 University of California, Berkeley - CIRM Center of Excellence**

Facilities Working Group Score: 88

Requested Funding: \$25,000,000
FWG Recommended Funding: \$22,000,000

Possible points →	Value 25	Leverage 25	Urgency 20	Shared Res 15	Function'ty 15
FWG Score: 88	20	24	18	12	14

PROPOSAL:

This applicant seeks CIRM funding for the construction of two floors of a six-story building that is to house programs in biomedical and health sciences. The request is for a CIRM Center of Excellence addressing basic discovery (Element X) and translational (Element Y) research activities. The total project cost is \$80,600,000 with a CIRM funding request of \$25 million. The CIRM-funded space would amount to 59,600 gross square feet (gsf) of the 200,000 gsf building or 29.8 percent of the total floor area of the project. The new building will provide research and teaching space for other campus programs on the other floors. The location of the CIRM Center will foster collaboration with other research programs in this new building, and with other institutions, including a hospital-based research group from a collaborating institution. The non-CIRM portion of the building will house several core facilities critical to stem cell work, including a vivarium expansion, an animal imaging core, and a molecular and cellular imaging core. The applicant believes that this CIRM Center will provide important momentum to the applicant's growing stem cell program.

The CIRM Center space consists of 40,975 assignable square feet (asf) that will include stem cell research laboratories for 12 Principal Investigators (PIs) and will house two important cores – a flow cytometry core and a cell culture core. Seven of the 12 PIs to be housed in the CIRM space are currently in other campus buildings and five PIs are to be recruited. The proposed facility will expand the space available for stem cell research in general, and human embryonic stem cell research in particular. The new space will provide researchers with facilities for culturing non-federal registry hESC cell lines. The core space will be open to other researchers at the applicant institution as well as researchers at collaborating institutions.

Completion of the project is scheduled for June 2010.

COST:**Cost Summary Table**

Cost Category	Total Amount	Amount/PI
Building	\$73,200,000	\$6,100,000
Group 2 Equipment	7,400,000	616,667
Total	\$80,600,000	\$6,716,667
CIRM Amount	\$25,000,000	\$2,083,333
Applicant Amount	\$55,600,000	\$4,633,333

* Based on number of PIs included in the Part 1 Capacity/Use table

SUMMARY OF FACILITIES WORKING GROUP REVIEW AND DISCUSSION

The reviewer summarized the proposal as very strong.

Value—The reviewer noted that the high cost of the proposal is offset by its high leverage. In explaining some of the factors contributing to the high cost, the applicant cited higher foundation costs due to seismic safety considerations, and the fact that the building overall has very intensive scientific space including vivarium space and bio-safety level 3 space. Difficult construction logistics at this urban campus and high labor costs were also noted by the applicant as contributing to costs. It was noted that this is the only applicant that is attempting to achieve platinum rating for LEEDS certification.

Leverage-- Leverage was noted to be nearly 1 to 2 and was described as excellent.

Urgency—The reviewer pointed out that the applicant meets the two year priority requirement.

Shared Resources—The reviewer noted that the project includes many core laboratories available to support the CIRM-funded spaces. The applicant described collaborations with institutions in the area, including hospital-based research centers.

Functionality—The laboratory planner scores were good, bolstered by the high support space to laboratory space ratio. The reviewer indicated that he agreed with the laboratory planner's assessment that functionality is excellent. Another reviewer noted that the design responds well to the needs of the science.

The FWG score for this application was 88. During programmatic review, the FWG voted to recommend funding of \$22,000,000, representing 88 percent of the requested amount of \$25 million.